DT

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,918	11/26/2001	Jessica Broussard	10014327-1	7574

22879 7590 11/17/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
LIU, MING HUN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2675	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DT

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/991,918	BROUSSARD, JESSICA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ming-Hun Liu	2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-27 and 29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-27 and 29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 21, 22 and 24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,007,038 to Han in view of US patent 5,872,892 to Brown et al.

In reference to claim 21, Han discloses a computer display that performs tilts and swivels with assistance of separate servomotors (column 1, lines 53-59). The difference that lies between the Han's and the applicant's invention is the input method. Han's invention concentrates on using a remote controller to adjust the display orientation where as the applicant utilizes a keyboard.

The idea of using a computer keyboard to control the mechanical movement of computer-controlled systems is not unique. Brown in his invention teaches the use of a keypad or computer keyboard (300) to control mechanical movements (column 10, lines 49-50).

As one skilled in the art understands, the conventional input methods computer systems are computer keyboards. One skilled in the art can modify the functionality of the computer keyboard to encompass the functionality of remote controller so as to control the mechanical movement of a system.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to embed the mechanical movement controller with the computer keyboard because keyboards are the standard input devices of computer systems and combining the functionality of different controlling components will reduce the number of redundant auxiliary control devices.

In reference to claim 22, it is shown in figure 1, items 71-74 and in column 4, lines 1-5, manual adjustment buttons are included in Han's invention.

As to claim 24, it is apparent from Han's description that a remote controller is used to control the orientation of the monitor (column 3, lines 1-10).

2. Claims 23, 25, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,007,038 to Han.in view of US Patent 6,411,934 to Moller et al.

In reference to claims 25, 27 and 30 Han discloses a computer display that performs tilts and swivels with assistance of separate servomotors (column 1, lines 53-59). Han's invention is similar to the one being claimed however his invention does lack the idea of including a voice recognition module that allows for the command of the display.

Moller on the other hand teaches the use of a voice recognition modular that translates vocal information into electrical signals used for the control of the actuating device (column 3, lines 8-17).

Han's invention can easily modified to resemble the claimed invention by including Moller's voice input device (2.1, 2.2 and 2) since Han's invention already includes an actuating device.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art include Moller's control unit into Han's invention to allow hands-free control of the position of the monitor.

As to claim 29, it is apparent from Han's description that a remote controller is used to control the orientation of the monitor (column 3, lines 1-10).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,007,038 to Han.in view of Moller et al and further in view of Brown et al.

The motivation behind combining Brown with Han is stated in the rejection of claim 21.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for two main reasons.

I. The definition of keyboard is "an assemblage of systematically arranged keys by which a machine or device is operated". With such a definition all previous rejections are correct. As shown in Jaynes, device 200 is in fact "an assemblage of systematically arranged keys by which a machine or device is operated". In fact, the combination of Jaynes was uncessary as Han already discloses the use of a "remote controller" which by obviousness is "an assemblage of systematically arranged keys by which a machine or device is operated".

II. Webster's dictionary defines remote controller as "device or mechanism for controlling something from a distance." Therefore "remote controllers" include the set of "keyboards", devices that used to control computers from a distance (as opposed to manually changing the transistors inside the CPU).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ming-Hun Liu whose telephone number is 703-305-8488. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ming-Hun Liu

DENNIS-DOON CHOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER